



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/663,485	09/13/2000	Manojit Sarkar	1384.009US1	2757
21186	7590	12/21/2004	EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A. P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			BATES, KEVIN T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2155	
DATE MAILED: 12/21/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Applicati n No.

09/663,485

Applicant(s)

SARKAR ET AL.

Examiner

Kevin Bates

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 November 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                                                        |                                                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                                       | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

***Response to Amendment***

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on November 16, 2004.

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dobbins (5828772) in view of Reichmeyer (6286038).

Regarding claim 1, Dobbins discloses a computerized method for provisioning router configuration data for a virtual router in a virtual private network (Column 2, lines 58 – 67), the method comprising: providing a switch with a set of processing resources (Column 6, lines 50 – 53); allocating a subset of the set or processing resources to a virtual router created within the switch (Column 6, lines 35 – 40); automatically determining a set of site reachability data (Column 9, line 66 – Column 10, line 4); and automatically generating a routing configuration for the virtual router based on the site reachability data and the routing protocol (Column 10, lines 42 – 46; Column 13, lines 48 – 59), but Dobbins does not explicitly indicate reading a routing profile said profile including a routing protocol. Reichmeyer teaches a system that includes configuring routers in a network that includes a configuration file for each router in the system that

informs the router of its functions (Column 2, lines 45 – 59) and that the configuration file specifies which routing protocol that the router should use (Column 1, lines 19). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Reichmeyer's teaching in Dobbins system in order to remotely configure a network device with a diverse set of attributes at the time the router is initialized (Column 1, lines 34 – 47; Column 2, lines 59 – 64).

Regarding claim 2, the combination of Dobbins and Reichmeyer discloses that the routing profile comprises a site profile (Reichmeyer, Column 2, lines 58 – 60).

Regarding claim 3, the combination of Dobbins and Reichmeyer discloses that the site includes a site type (Reichmeyer, Column 2, lines 58 – 60).

Regarding claim 4, the combination of Dobbins and Reichmeyer discloses that the site profile includes a set of one or more site subnets (Reichmeyer, Column 5, lines 30 – 38).

Regarding claim 5, the combination of Dobbins and Reichmeyer discloses that the routing profile comprises a global profile (Reichmeyer, Column 6, lines 31 – 42).

Regarding claim 6, the combination of Dobbins and Reichmeyer discloses that the global profile includes a default routing protocol for the ISP edge (Reichmeyer, Column 2, line 65 – Column 3, line 6; Column 5, lines 47 – 50).

Regarding claim 7, the combination of Dobbins and Reichmeyer discloses that the global profile includes a default site type (Reichmeyer, Column 2, line 65 – Column 3, line 6).

Regarding claim 8, the combination of Dobbins and Reichmeyer discloses disseminating the set of site reachability data to other routers in a virtual private network (VPN) (Dobbins, Column 14, lines 13 – 23).

Regarding claim 9, the combination of Dobbins and Reichmeyer discloses disseminating the set of site reachability data comprises reading a set of subnets for a site and creating static routes for the set of subnets (Dobbins, Column 4, lines 47 – 56).

Regarding claim 10, the combination of Dobbins and Reichmeyer discloses disseminating the set of site reachability data comprises placing the set of site; reachability information in a directory (Dobbins, Column 2, lines 43 – 53).

Regarding claim 11, the combination of Dobbins and Reichmeyer discloses that the routing profile comprises an OSPF profile (Reichmeyer, Column 5, lines 52 – 59).

Regarding claim 12, the combination of Dobbins and Reichmeyer discloses that the OSPF profile includes a route aggregation policy (Reichmeyer, Column 5, lines 52 – 59).

Regarding claim 13, the combination of Dobbins and Reichmeyer discloses that the OSPF profile includes an OSPF area defining a set of virtual routers, and wherein generating a configuration includes generating a configuration for each virtual router in the set of virtual router (Reichmeyer, Column 5, lines 39 – 59; Column 6, lines 31 – 42).

Regarding claim 14, the combination of Dobbins and Reichmeyer discloses receiving a selection of one or more virtual routers to receive the generated configuration (Dobbins, Column 14, lines 12 – 16).

Regarding claim 15, Dobbins discloses a method of configuring a subset of virtual routers in a set of virtual routers created on a switch (Column 6, lines 35 – 40), the method comprising, but Dobbins does not explicitly indicate generating a configuration for the set of virtual routers, said configuration based on at least one routing profile, said profile including a routing policy; receiving a change in the routing policy; displaying a list of virtual routers in the set of virtual routers that were configured using the routing policy; receiving a selection of the subset of virtual routers in the set of virtual routers; and regenerating the configuration for the subset of the virtual routers based on the change in the policy. Reichmeyer teaches generating a configuration for the set of virtual routers (Column 5, line 63 – Column 6, line 13), said configuration based on at least one routing profile (Column 6, lines 2 – 5), said profile including a routing policy (Column 2, lines 54 – 64); receiving a change in the routing policy (Column 6, lines 31 – 42); displaying a list of virtual routers in the set of virtual routers that were configured using the routing policy (Column 6, lines 31 – 42); receiving a selection of the subset of virtual routers in the set of virtual routers (Column 5, lines 26 – 34); and regenerating the configuration for the subset of the virtual routers based on the change in the policy (Column 10, lines 54 – 67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Reichmeyer's teaching in Dobbins system in order to remotely configure a network device with a diverse set of attributes at the time the router is initialized (Column 1, lines 34 – 47; Column 2, lines 59 – 64).

Regarding claim 16, the combination of Dobbins and Reichmeyer discloses that the routing profile comprises a site profile (Column 2, lines 58 – 60).

Regarding claim 17, the combination of Dobbins and Reichmeyer discloses that the routing profile comprises a global routing profile (Column 6, lines 31 – 42).

Regarding claim 18, the combination of Dobbins and Reichmeyer discloses that the routing policy comprises an OSPF routing profile (Column 5, lines 52 – 59).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 15-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that the combination of Dobbins and Reichmeyer does not disclose virtual routers or have those virtual routers allocated in a single switch. The examiner disagrees, as seen in Column 6, lines 35 – 53 in the reference Dobbins, one or more virtual routers are present in the system and they are located on a single switch.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Bates whose telephone number is (571) 272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2155

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KB

KB  
December 15, 2004

  
HOSAIN ALAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER